

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants:	Robert A. BOTHAM et al.	§	Confirmation No.:	6075
		§		
Serial No.:	09/997,340	§	Group Art Unit:	3623
		§		
Filed:	11/29/2001	§	Examiner:	David Robertson
		§		
For:	Method For Receiving	§	Docket No.:	200302166-1
	And Reconciling Physical	§		
	Inventory Data Against	§		
	An Asset Management	§		
	System From A Remote	§		
	Location	§		

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents

Date: March 7, 2008

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answers dated January 24 and February 20, 2008, Appellants submit this Reply Brief.

I. RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS OF THE EXAMINER'S ANSWER

In the Response to Arguments section of the Reply Brief, the following statements are made.

In the embodiment specifically disclosed, Christensen *inherently* produces a copy of the *main asset database* and a second intermediate database prior to reconciliation, and therefore, Christensen teaches *reconciling an intermediate database against a copy of the main asset management database*.¹

Appellants respectfully traverse. The Answer makes multiple attempts to prove the existence of the copy of the main asset management database prior to reconciliation.² However, even if hypothetically assumed that Christensen

¹ Reply Brief, Page 9, second full paragraph (emphasis original).

² Reply Brief, Page 9, first full paragraph through Page 10, paragraph spanning pages 9 and 10; Page 11, paragraph spanning pages 11 and 12.

teaches producing a copy of the main asset database and a second intermediate database prior to reconciliation (which Appellants do not admit), it simply does not follow that Christensen teaches reconciling the intermediate database against the copy of the main asset management database **as Christensen expressly teaches reconciling directly against the main asset database.**³

Moreover, the copy of the main asset management database in Christensen is transferred to the PDA 230 and updated in the physical inventory.⁴ The updated copy is then transferred back to the manipulation module 220 and converted to database data structure form before being reconciled directly against the main asset management database.⁵ Thus, the copy of the main asset management database becomes an intermediate database, and under the logic suggested by the Answer the intermediate database is then reconciled against itself.

With respect to the argument regarding Eckman, the Response to Arguments section of the Answer states:

Ekman was used to teach only that it was known in the art of inventory assessment at the time of the invention to place a flag on each location code (for each resource) in an asset management database.⁶

The reliance is misplaced because Eckman does not teach placing a flag on each location code in an asset management database. Eckman expressly teaches placing the flags in the subledgers of the car code readers, not the main asset management database.⁷ Moreover, with respect to the flags of Eckman the teaching is diametrically opposed to the claim language. Eckman expressly teaches that a fixed asset record is flagged only when the asset is found. By contrast, representative claim 34 requires "placing identifying indicia on each

³ Christensen Col. 12, lines 6-13.

⁴ Christensen Col. 11, line 65 – Col. 12, line 5.

⁵ Christensen Col. 12, lines 6-13.

⁶ Reply Brief Page 10, paragraph spanning pages 10 and 11.

⁷ Eckman Page 60, left column.

Appl. No. 09/997,340

Reply Brief dated March 7, 2008

Reply to Examiner's Answers of January 24 and February 20, 2008

location code.” Eckman expressly teaches that the flag is placed on the record in the subledger contained within the bar code reader. By contrast, representative claim 34 requires, “placing identifying indicia ... in the asset management database.” In Eckman, “exceptions” are noted by the lack of a flag on a record. By contrast, representative claim 34 requires “identifying assets not found during the physical inventory in the asset management database by identifying location codes having the identifying indicia.”

II. CONCLUSION

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/mes/

Mark E. Scott
PTO Reg. No. 43,100
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 610-3410 (Phone)
(512) 610-3456 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400